Hosty

to the writer [illegible] Harold Weisberg 1/12/76

[illegible] in the third page of my memo on the batches of Hosty records disclosed to date, the third we sent to me. I dox this separately in part for my own filing and in part because I make copies of only the [illegible] batch. I'll keep the original of the memo because it will make better copies for my subject filing. For the same or similar reasons I'll do the same with the second record, a long one of which I've xeroxed selected pages only. Please do not take this to mean that I believe there is nothing else of value in this batch. There may well be and I may well have missed it because I'm into what now appears to be my annual siege of bronchial infections, this being the third straight year. Last night for the first in two weeks that I got four continuous hours of sleep. But the appropriate medicine brings its own problems, one of them the subject of complaint by my ulcer. So, I urge on your own examinations and if you'd like questions. I'm keeping them as I receive them, filed separately as the lowest to bird.

The 12/31/75 Memo to HQ covering a memo to the Senate Intelligence Committee (FBI code name not used here "Senstudy") and the memo itself are typical of how the FBI lies when it wants to lie and prepares its lies so it can, if necessary, explain them away. Not uncommonly with indignation. (#66)

Item 1 reflects the Senate's interest in the Hosty censuring. The Senate reference to one and the FBI here does not volunteer that he was censured at least twice, as is reflected in his own memo on the previous page of my memo reflected. The Senate is told to come to FBIHQ to see what it wants to see. Those records were disclosed to me. Reflects the FBI's respect for the Senate, HQ and those are redacted copies, withholding from the Senate the names of others than disciplined, on the same cover the Bureau's assumes, when they'd done nothing wrong. Their names also, to the best of my recollection are disclosed.

No, 2 on 2 refers to a request for records relating to the second censuring of Hosty, "on or about September 20, 1964." [illegible] doesn't the FBI know I suggest a possible explanation of this formulation: proofs of the Warren report were out and given to even the press 9/24. I have a press story I've given it to Lincoln. Just I've seen it. It is page proofs of the final version of the Report. And he told to go to FBIHQ to see those records. They were later disclosed to me.

Until about this time the FBI refuses all requests for such information from the Congress on the ground that it was making an investigation and had not completed it. I've read the records of the investigation and what it was really up to in keeping everything under wraps and its control so it could create a situation in which no action could be taken against anyone. I have separate subject-file copies, I believe with memos, of what for me are the originals.

Item 1) is written in a manner that leaves it up to the reader to comprehend the FBI's question, and from the language I take it this is the Hosty destruction of Oswald's pre-assassination letter to him. The request indicates that the FBI was uninformed or misinformed, as the FBI refers to the request, and the FBI was not about to get the matter straight for the Senate. The language here is, "Item 1) requests all materials pertaining to the matter subsequent to November 22, 1963 and prior to the submission of the Bureau's initial report to the White House...by captioned. The report referred to, 62, was forwarded 12/9/63 and it makes no mention of the Oswald letter and its destruction. But if you will look at No Impact 1 in the first batch where I've copied it for you with a supervisor at that point, 1 or 2, that states that this was "handled" at FBIHQ on 11/26. And "Dan had also not refer to Oswald's first knowledge but to its solution. It also, of course, is acknowledgment of FBIHQ knowledge, which is from the very first, has records [illegible] on the people in the so-called definitive report.